REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the preceding amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-28 and 30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 28 are amended. Claims 1, 8 and 28 are independent claims. Claim 29 is cancelled. Claim 30 is added. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 8 and 28 is provided by at least paragraph [0014] of the Applicants' disclosure, and support for new claim 30 is provided by at least paragraph [0040] of the Applicants' disclosure.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the references included in the Information Disclosure Statement filed October 31, 2003 have been considered; that certified copies of the priority documents have been received by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO); and that the drawings have been accepted by the USPTO.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have cancelled this claim, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Brief Description of Example Embodiments

Before turning to the outstanding art rejection, a brief review of example embodiments is detailed below that may aid the Examiner in understanding various features of the claims. Example embodiments are based on the consideration that, in a server/client architecture for a computer system, particularly when the transfer channel involved is the Internet, asynchronous

transfer of messages/signals from the server computer to the client computer is necessary in order to recognize all important signals/messages quickly and to identify them with certainty using the client computer.[1] If the asynchronous transfer of messages/signals is not provided, then the client computer can only recognize such signals and messages as having already arisen on the server computer before a connection has been set up between the client computer and the server computer with difficulty. As such, this recognition by the client computer cannot be done quickly or easily using conventional methods.[2]

Accordingly, example embodiments assign a further message signal to each message signal at the client servers so that the further message signal can be quickly transmitted to the client computer without waiting for additional processing by the server computer to be completed. In particular, the further message signal is transferred to the client computer, whereas the original message signal may be processed by the server computer and not necessarily sent to the client computer. In this respect, the message signal and the further message signal associated therewith are decoupled in terms of their later fate.[3]

Based on the above description of example embodiments in the Applicants' disclosure, independent claims 1, 8 and 28 are amended to recite, *inter alia*, "**a fate of the at least one message signal and the at least one further message signal are decoupled**." Applicants submit that at least the above-emphasized features of amended independent claims 1, 8 and 28 patentably distinguish over the cited reference as detailed below.

---

[1] Applicants specification, page 3, paragraph [0012].
[2] Applicants specification, page 3, paragraph [0013].
[3] Applicants disclosure, page 3, paragraph [0015].

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Steen et al. (WO/0062136, herein Steen). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as detailed below.

Amended Independent Claims 1, 8 and 28:

Regarding the assigning and writing recited in amended independent claim 1, the Examiner cites page 13, lines 17-19 which states, "the CRON 504 takes the **incoming messages** and updates the database 506, then further sends **messages to the user pager service or other notification device**." However, as shown in FIG. 2 of Steen, the message sent by the CRON 504 to the alpha numeric pager service local or nationwide, which the Examiner appears to be reading on the at least one further message of independent claim 1, **is transmitted externally to the alpha numeric pager service local or nationwide as shown by the solid arrow which crosses the dotted line representing the cyber sensor server 500**. Accordingly, this portion of Steen should not be used to anticipate the "writing the at least one further message signal to at least one pipe of the server computer," as recited in independent claim 1. The writing step recited in claim 1 takes place within server computer 10 as shown in FIG. 1 of the Applicants' disclosure in which the pipes are identified by reference numbers 35, 37 and 39.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Steen fails to disclose, teach or suggest the specific relationships between the at least one message signal and at least one further message signal recited in amended independent claims 1, 8 and 28. In particular, Steen fails to disclose, teach or suggest "**wherein a fate of the at least one message signal and the at least one further message signal are decoupled**."

Dependent claims 2 and 9:

Applicants would also like to take this opportunity to specifically address the features of dependent claims 2 and 9. In particular, dependent claim 2 indicates that the client computer includes at least one communication software program and recites "**using the at least one communication software program** to set up the connection to the server and **to execute an audio program of the server computer**." Regarding the features of dependent claim 2, the Examiner cites Steen, page 3, lines 13-22 and page 6, line 23 to page 7, line 10. However, Applicants submit that these cited portions of Steen fail to mention executed an audio program, much less a client computer causing the server computer to execute an audio program of the server computer. Applicants acknowledge that page 8, lines 5-6 of Steen recites a function of providing an alarm or an error signal to the users' pager network to signal an error. However, this alarm takes place at the pager and is triggered by the server. Accordingly, even this portion of Steen fails to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in dependent claim 2 or the somewhat similar features of dependent claim 9.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Steen fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features of the various independent claims and dependent claims as detailed above with respect to amended independent claims 1, 8 and 28, as well as dependent claims 2 and 9.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

New Claim

New claim 30 is added by this response and is believed to further distinguish over Steen. New claim 30 recites "a sound content of the audio program is characteristic of the associated at least one further message," and support for this amendment is provided by at least paragraph [0040] of the Applicants' disclosure. Having sound content characteristic to a specific message signal may allow a user to easily identify what type of message is recorded and/or requires action.

Applicants submit that Steen is silent regarding the features of newly added dependent claim 30.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-29 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required $120 extension fee herewith.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By   _____

For   Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/SAE/ame